

Table 3. Criteria Used to Define the No-Action Alternative

Criteria	Discussion
Criterion 1: Has the action been approved for implementation?	To be included in the No-Action Alternative, implementation of the action must have been approved by the project sponsor or by the ultimate authorizing agency. In the case of a construction-related project, this approval must include authorization for design and construction.
Criterion 2: Does the action have funding for implementation?	To be included in the No-Action Alternative, an action must have sufficient approved funding to provide for its implementation.
Criterion 3: Does the action have final environmental documents?	This criterion would be satisfied if all environmental documents and approvals necessary for implementation of the action have been completed.
Criterion 4: Does the action have final environmental permits and approvals?	This criterion would be satisfied if all final major permits and approvals (e.g., a Section 404 Permit or Endangered Species Act compliance) necessary to implement the action have been obtained.
Criterion 5: Will the action be excluded from the CALFED actions?	Actions that will be included in the action alternatives for CALFED will not be included in the No-Action Alternative. A comparison of the action alternatives with the No-Action Alternative would be distorted if an action were included in both.
Criterion 6: Would the effects of the action be identifiable at the level of detail being considered for CALFED analysis?	If a project's effects would be undetectable or minor in the programmatic impact analysis, the project need not be included in the No-Action Alternative. For example, if a project to be implemented by a water user could change localized conditions near the project but would not affect regional conditions, or if those changes would be minor, the action may not need to be included in the No-Action Alternative. This criterion is intended to avoid inclusion of actions that would not materially affect the outcome of the CALFED alternatives analysis.